UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg	2004P00102WOUS	5252

24737 7590 12/27/2011

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
JOHN, CLARENCE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/27/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com
debbie.henn@philips.com
marianne.fox@philips.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,047	BRONNENBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLARENCE JOHN	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 October 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *13-32* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *13-32* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 October 2011* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

This action is responsive to Communication filed on October 6, 2011. Claims 13-32 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. The Applicant's arguments filed on 10/6/2011 have been fully considered but they are **moot** in view of the new ground of rejection presented by Hamanaka et al. (US 2003/0009484).

2. Applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited below that would overcome the 103(a) rejections applied against the claims, the rejection is therefore sustained.

Specification

3. Claims 13 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 13 and 25 recite, " ... in a further directory different form the content directory...".
4. The above limitation should read as, "... different **from** the content directory...".
5. .Appropriate correction is required.

6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

7. Claims 13 and 25 recite the phrase "...a further directory different from the content directory ..." . This phrase is not defined anywhere in the specification. There is lack of antecedent basis for this Claimed limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Amended Independent Claims 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

9. Amended Independent Claim 13 recites, "... storing removed information removed by the periodically filtering act in **a further directory different from the content directory** ...".

10. Storing removed information removed by the periodically filtering act in **a "further directory different from" the content directory** is not disclosed anywhere in the Specification. This is considered new matter.

11. Amended Independent Claim 25 also recites, "... wherein the storage element further contains removed information removed by the at least one filtering element in **a further directory different from the content directory** ...".

12. The storage element further contains removed information removed by the at least one filtering element in **a "further directory different from" the content directory** is not disclosed anywhere in the Specification. This is considered new matter.

13. Dependent Claims 14-24 and 26-32 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for incorporating the defects of their corresponding Independent claims from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 13, 15, 17, 19, and 22 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al. (US 2003/0074473) in view of Hughes et al. (US 6,065,055) in further view of Hamanaka et al. (US 2003/0009484).

15. With respect to Claim 13, Pham teaches a method of filtering and storing information describing characteristics of content stored on at least one network device and accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprising the steps of : filtering information describing characteristics of the stored content to yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content (Figure 1, Figure 2, Page 3 – paragraph [0036], paragraph [0038], Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12) that cannot be rendered by at least any of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92); storing in a content directory the filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of said plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]); and searching or browsing the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); wherein said searching or browsing of the content

directory to review said filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices is performed independently (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which is performed independently)

16. Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However, Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.
17. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor. The scan and filter functions are checked in the Proxy monitor configuration and the scan interval is set to 5 minutes.
18. Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and storing information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.
19. Pham and Hughes teach the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. Pham and Hughes also teach about periodic filtering and storing filtered information in a content directory periodic filtering However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly

state about storing removed information in a further directory different from the content directory.

20. Conversely Hamanaka teaches the above limitation. Hamanaka teaches file management system which provides placement of files and assigning them to specific directories.

21. Hamanaka also teaches storing removed information in a further directory different from the content directory. (Figure 7, Page 6 - paragraph [0111]. Here, a removed file from parent directory or content directory or previous storage area is moved to a different directory and re-registered to a new parent directory.

22. Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and storing information on servers and devices. Hamanaka also teaches about storing files in storage areas and servers. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hamanaka with Pham and Hughes by implementing a file management system which organizes files and stores in different storage areas in order to conserve and control directory based quota to improve the usability of file systems.

23. With respect to Claim 15, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the method as claimed in Claim 13, wherein content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which

cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92) comprises content having a transport protocol that is not compatible with any of the plurality of network rendering devices. (Pham - Page 5 paragraph [0050] lines 1-12, lines 19-12. Here, IPsec protocol is the transport protocol used to transfer packets to crypto processor 86 which is not compatible with one network device)

24. With respect to Claim 17, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka the limitation as described in Claim 13 above. However, Pham and Hamanaka do not explicitly state about said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices is repeated over a "predefined time interval".
25. Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Hughe's teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval of 5 minutes).
26. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. Hamanaka also teaches about storing files in storage areas and servers. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham and Hamanaka in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

27. With respect to Claim 19, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach a method as claimed in claim 13 wherein said periodic filtering of information describing characteristics of content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices is performed when a new network rendering device is added to the network. (Pham's teachings on Figure 1, Page 3 – paragraph [0039] lines 8-12. Here, the establishment of new network connection includes the remote gateway 20).

28. With respect to Claim 22, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach a method as claimed in claim 13, further comprises the act of selecting content for transfer via the network to any of the network rendering devices, (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 19-22); wherein said selecting is based on the searching or browsing step, (Pham - Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and wherein said content selected for transfer is renderable by any of the network rendering devices. (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0052] lines 1-4).

29. With respect to Claim 23, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach a method as claimed in claim 13 wherein the act of storing removed information comprises the act of : filtering information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered information including information describing characteristics of content (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by any

of the plurality of network rendering devices, (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92); and making available on the network said filtered information including information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices. (Pham Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]. The stored information is available on the network).

30. Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka the limitation of Claim 23 as described above. However, Pham and Hamanaka do not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

31. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

32. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. Hamanaka also teaches about storing files in storage areas and servers. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

33. With respect to Claim 24, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach a method as claimed in claim 23, wherein said method further comprises the act of : initiating an action based on said filtered information including information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices, wherein the action comprises **any** of the following: upgrading the network; b) downloading and/or installing a codec; c) adapting a security parameter; (Pham - Page 1 – paragraph [0008] lines 1-10, Page – paragraph [0039] lines 18-22) d) recommending the purchase or upgrade of at least one network rendering device; and e) providing a human-perceptible explanation of why content is unusable by the at least one network rendering device.

34. With respect to Claim 25, Pham teaches a device adapted for filtering and storing information describing characteristics of content accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the device comprising: a) at least one filtering element adapted to filter information describing characteristics of the content to yield filtered information devoid of content (Figure 1, Figure 2, Page 3 – paragraph [0036], paragraph [0038], Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12) that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices; (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control

processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92); and b) a storage element containing a content directory including the filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]);

35. wherein the content directory is searchable or browseable to enable review of said filtered information describing characteristics devoid of information describing characteristics of the content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices, (Page 7, paragraph [0064], Page 8, paragraph [0068] lines 14-19); and searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices is performed independently of said periodic filtering by the at least one filtering element. (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which is performed independently); to yield filtered information devoid of information describing characteristics of content (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); that cannot be rendered by any of the plurality of network rendering devices. (Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84 which cannot be provided by the previous network processor 92).

36. Pham teaches the limitations of Claim 25 as described above. However, Pham does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

37. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

38. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hughes with Pham in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

39. Pham and Hughes teach the limitations of Claim 25 as described above. Pham and Hughes also teach about filtering element and storage element containing removed information in a content directory. However, Pham and Hughes do not explicitly state about storage element which contains removed information in a directory different from the content directory.

40. Conversely Hamanaka teaches the above limitation. Hamanaka teaches file management system which provides placement of files and assigning them to specific directories.

41. Hamanaka also teaches storing removed information in a further directory different from the content directory. (Figure 7, Page 6 - paragraph [0111]. Here, a

removed file from parent directory or content directory or previous storage area is moved to a different directory and re-registered to a new parent directory.

42. Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and storing information on servers and devices. Hamanaka and Carbonneau also teach about storing files in storage areas and servers. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hamanaka with Pham and Hughes by implementing a file management system which organizes files and stores in different storage areas in order to conserve and control directory based quota to improve the usability of file systems.

43. With respect to Claim 26, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach a media server embodying the device of claim 25. (Pham - Figure 1, Page 1 – paragraph [0009] lines 3-8).

44. With respect to Claim 27, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach a network comprising the device of claim 25 (Pham - Figure 1); and at least one network rendering device (Pham -Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 12-19. Here the data is explicitly provided by the control processor 84).

45. Claims 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in further view of Carbonneau et al. (US 5835700).

46. With respect to Claims 28 and 31, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations of Claim 13 and 25 respectively. Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka also teach about further directory including the removed information. However, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state about and determining upgrades of the network based on the accessing act.

47. Conversely, Carbonneau teaches this limitation. Carbonneau teaches a Local Area Network consisting of client/server and storage system containing plurality of removable storage units. Carbonneau also teaches determining upgrades of the network based on the accessing act. (Column 17, lines 17-25. Here the network manager determines whether an upgrade to the network such as adding an additional storage capacity based on the usage traffic to a drive containing licensed software).

48. Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and storing information on servers and devices. Hamanaka and Carbonneau teaches about storing units. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Carbonneau with Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka by implementing a system where the administrator or network manager evaluates the network and

determines an upgrade based on network compatibility by replacing the appropriate device in order to improve network performance.

49.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in further view of Barton (US 2005/0193060).

50. With respect to Claim 29, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka also teach about storing removed in a further directory. However, information However Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state about hidden content hidden from a user when performing the searching or browsing act.

51. Conversely, Barton teaches the above limitation. Barton teaches a network consisting of various controlling devices and storage units. Barton also teaches hidden content hidden from a user when performing the searching or browsing act. (Page 4 – paragraph [0035]. Here the user can access and add content to a document before transmitting to a temporary storage unit but cannot access the documents on other user's control units. Keeping content hidden from the other participants allows the user to browse the content on the control unit before moving the content.

52. Pham and Hughes have common grounds of teaching about filtering and storing information on servers and devices. Hamanaka and Barton also teach about

storing file content in storage areas and servers. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Barton with Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka by implementing a system where authorized users have access to hidden content from other participants in order to preserve user's privacy.

53. Claims 14, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US 2003/0023671)

54. With respect to Claim 14, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state in their teachings about the content which is not compatible with the plurality of network rendering devices.

55. Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5. Here if a file compatibility error has occurred, the application content is incompatible as configured by network rendering devices).

56. Pham, Hughes, Hamanaka and Abdulrahiman have common grounds of storing contents among the servers and storage devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

57. With respect to Claims 30 and 32, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations of Claim 13 and 25 respectively. Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka also teach about periodic filtering and storing removed content in a different directory. However, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state about the filtered content or filtered element is unusable by any of the plurality of network rendering devices.

58. Conversely Abdulrahiman does in fact teach such a limitation. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not usable by any of the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5. Here if a file compatibility error has occurred, the application content cannot be used as configured by network rendering devices).

59. Pham, Hughes, Hamanaka and Abdulrahiman have common grounds of storing contents among the servers and storage devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

combined the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Pham and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

60. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

61. With respect to Claim 16, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state about teaching a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

62. Conversely Safadi does in fact teach such a limitation. In one embodiment, Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2, paragraph [0021, lines 1-2). In another embodiment, Safadi teaches about a content having a DRM scheme or system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices (Page 3 – paragraph [0038] lines 2-7, Network device 200 - Figure 1). Here the original DRM scheme of a particular content is converted to a native DRM scheme only if the consumer's Network device 200 is not compatible or not supported.

63. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Hamanaka also teaches about storing files in storage areas and servers. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.

64. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).

65. With respect to Claim 18, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state about teaching a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network.

66. Conversely Gorman teaches the above limitation. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

67. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Hamanaka also teaches about storing files in storage areas and servers. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

68. With respect to Claim 20, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. Also, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach a method of filtering (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-12); and storing information describing characteristics of content is performed (Pham - Page 5, paragraph [0050] lines 1-6]); for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).

69. However Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state about filtering which is performed when a network device has been removed.

70. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

71. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Hamanaka also teaches about storing files in storage areas and servers. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

72. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka in further view of Phan et al. (US 2004/0193609).

73. With respect to Claim 21,Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka teach the limitations as described in Claim 13. However, Pham, Hughes and Hamanaka do not explicitly state in their teachings wherein the network is a UPnP network and the information about the content is stored by a UPnP content directory service.

74. Conversely Phan does in fact teach such a limitation. Phan teaches a master content directory service representing all of the content within the network. (Abstract lines 1-3). Phan also teaches a UPnP architecture defining general interaction between UPnP control points and UPnP network devices (Page 2 – paragraph [0020], Page 3 - paragraph [0024]); and the information about content is stored by an UPnP content directory service Page 2 – paragraph [0020] lines 12-16, Page 5 – paragraph [0040] lines 7-12).

75. Pham and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices over a network. Hamanaka also teaches about storing files in storage areas and servers. Phan also teaches storing information content in a communication network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Phan with Pham Hughes and Hamanaka by employing a UPnP network which is self configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and controlling other devices.

Conclusion

The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and /or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its corresponding support in the specification.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443
12/16/2011

/TONIA L.M. DOLLINGER/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit